



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

has had no official recognition, if my memory serves me right, from the different governments, although it is composed of persons that go from the different parliaments. The next step, now, is an official organization of that Interparliamentary Union, with advisory powers at first that shall become legislative powers in turn by and by.

First comes an organic intelligence of the nations, next an organic will of the nations, and next an organic executive power of the nations,—and less armament? Yes. How shall we determine how much less armament? Why, just as long as you have this conception that England must have her armies and navies to protect her interests, that America must have her army and navy to protect her interests, and France the same, just so long you will have more or less of competition between the contending nations, each determined at least to be strong enough to resist its neighbor if it is attacked. It may be that Russia is the only country that would object to less armament, but I suspect that so long as she objects, Japan will object too. Napoleon undertook to make all Europe one great empire without a national consciousness, without a national intelligence, or a national will, focussing all in his own brain. Europe not merely combined in intelligence, in law, in will, but it combined also in force, and it put force, the military forces of Europe, under the direction of a common leader to protect every nation from the one whom they regarded as the foe of all the nations. The Boxer movement threatened representatives of every nation. We did not send to their relief a Japanese force under a Japanese commander, a German force under a German commander, an English force under an English commander, and an American force under an American commander; we said, "Here is police duty to be done," and the police forces were put under one man and marched to Peking,—English, German, French, and Japanese, under a German commander.

Here, as I take it, we are to dream dreams and see visions. The young men and the old men are to dream dreams and see visions. That is what we are at Lake Mohonk for, and so I make no apology or excuse whatever for saying what is my dream and my vision. It is this: The time is coming when all the military forces of the civilized world will be one police force, under one chief of police, with one international legislature, to decide what is the will of the nations, and with one international court to interpret the official and legal intelligence of the nations. There will be just enough army and just enough navy to make the world safe, under a common direction and a common control, and no more. [Applause.] To-day Europe is pretending to dread "the yellow peril." Possibly a few Europeans do, but I do not think any very sane ones do. China really does dread the white peril, and has reason to. How shall we obviate this difficulty? How shall we of the west avoid the yellow peril, and they of the east avoid the white peril? There are two ways: One way is, that we build up armies and navies and get ready for the worst war the world has ever seen; the other way is to say, An end to this way of settling difficulties. China, Japan, Russia, Europe and America,—we will have a common intelligence through a court; we will form a common will through an Interparliamentary

Union, and we will form a common chief of the police, call him what you will. This is the sane way. It is the righteous way. It is the way in which lies peace.

The world is moving very fast,—very fast. When Edward Everett Hale, in 1895, said here, "We want a permanent court of arbitration, a permanent tribunal," there were men on this floor, you remember, who said, "This is the dream of the dreamer, and the vision of the visionary." In four years we had it. It is pretty hard to keep ahead of God. Just now he is moving fast. He has run ahead of the chariot. He has girt up his loins and run rapidly. What we want to-day—well, what I want—is not a court merely to settle individual difficulties. We have got that already. Not merely a body of men is wanted to come together and consult on international matters, though we are going to have that. What I want to see is a common international consciousness and a common international life. The Psalmist said, "The kings of the earth take counsel together against the Lord and against his anointed," and they certainly did. What we want is that the kings of the earth shall take counsel together for the Lord and for his anointed. Paul said, "The kingdom of God"—what is it? "Righteousness, peace and joy." What we want is a common international consciousness, interpreted by a common international tribunal, expressing itself in a common international will,—a parliament, enforced by a common international executive, that shall make for justice, for peace and for human welfare. [Applause.]

The Triumphs of Peace.

ADDRESS OF CARDINAL GIBBONS.

Nearly two thousand years have rolled by since the birth of the Prince of Peace, whose advent was announced by the angelic host singing, "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace to men of goodwill." Christ's mission on earth was to establish a triple peace in the hearts of men,—peace with God by the observance of his commandments, peace with our fellowmen by the practice of justice and charity, and peace within our own breasts by keeping our passions subject to reason, and our reason in harmony with the divine law. When looking back and contemplating the wars that have ravaged the Christian world during the last twenty centuries, some persons might be tempted at first sight to exclaim in anguish of heart that the mission of Christ has been a failure. My purpose, in the brief remarks which I shall make, is to disabuse the faint-hearted of this discouraging impression.

It is by comparisons and contrasts that we can most effectually gauge the results of Christian civilization. Let us compare the military history of the Roman Empire with the military record of our American Republic. In pagan Rome war was the rule, peace the exception. The temple of Janus in Rome was always open in time of war, and was closed in time of peace. From the reign of Romulus to the time of Augustus Cæsar, seven hundred years, the temple of Janus was always open except twice, when it was closed for six years. The United States has existed as a sovereign nation for about one hundred and twenty years, since the close of the Revolution. During that period we have had four wars:

the War with England from 1812 to 1815, the War with Mexico, the Civil War and the recent Spanish War. The combined length of these campaigns was about ten years. Hence we see that the United States has enjoyed twelve years of peace for every year of war, while the Roman Empire enjoyed less than one year of tranquillity for every century of military engagements. I may remark in passing that at least three of these four military campaigns might have been easily averted by peaceful arbitration, and that a large share of the responsibility rests at our doors that this was not the case.

But the blessed influence of Christian civilization has been experienced not only in reducing the number of wars, but still more in mitigating the horrors of military strife. Prior to the dawn of Christianity, the motto of the conqueror was: "Woe to the vanquished." The captured cities were pillaged and laid waste. The wives and daughters of the defeated nation became the prey of the ruthless soldiery. The conquered generals and army were obliged to grace the triumphs of the victors before they were condemned to death or to ignominious bondage. Alexander the Great, after the capture of the city of Tyre, ordered two thousand of the inhabitants to be crucified, and the remainder of the population were put to death or sold into slavery. How different was the conduct of General Scott after the successful siege of the city of Mexico. As soon as the enemy surrendered not a single soldier or citizen was sacrificed to the vengeance of the victorious army, and not a single family was exiled from their native land. During the siege of Jerusalem in the year 70 of the Christian era, under Titus, the Roman General, more than a million Jews perished by the sword or by famine. Nearly one hundred thousand Jews were carried into captivity. The sacred vessels of the temple of Jerusalem were borne away by the blood-stained hands of the Roman army. Let us contrast the conduct of Titus towards the Jews with General Grant's treatment of the defeated Confederate forces. When General Lee surrendered at Appomattox Courthouse, he and his brave army were permitted to return without molestation to their respective homes. The Roman and the American General, in their opposite conduct, were reflecting the spirit of the times in which they lived. Titus, in exercising cruelty towards the vanquished, was following the traditions of paganism. Grant, in his magnanimity toward the Confederate troops, was obeying the mandates of Christian civilization.

And now, friends and advocates of international arbitration, permit me to greet you with words of good cheer and congratulation. You are engaged in the most noble and benevolent mission that can engross the attention of mankind, — a mission to which are attached the most sublime title and the most precious reward, "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God." I beg you to consider what progress has already been made in the beneficent work in which you are enlisted. A hundred years ago disputes between individuals were commonly decided by a duel. Thanks to the humanizing influence of a Christian public opinion, these disagreements are now usually adjusted by legislation or conciliation. Have we not reason to indulge the hope that the same pacific agencies which have checked the duel between individuals will, in God's own time, check the duel between nations?

In our schoolboy days, the most odious and contemptible creature we used to encounter was the bully who played the tyrant toward the weak, but cringed before his strong companions. But still more intolerable is a bullying nation that picks a quarrel with a feeble nation with the base intent of seizing her possessions. Friends and advocates of international arbitration, let it be your mission to protect the weak against the strong; and then to the ruler of a feeble nation may be applied the words of the poet:

"Thrice is he armed who hath his quarrel just."

He is armed with the consciousness of the sacred right of property. He is armed with the shield of an enlightened public opinion. He is armed with the conviction that his cause will be adjudicated by the equitable decision of a board of arbitration.

This amicable system, while protecting the rights of the weak, will not wound or humiliate the national pride of the strong, since it does not attempt to trench on the sovereignty or autonomy of the stronger power. I can recall at least four instances within the last twenty years in which international conflicts have been amicably settled by arbitration. The dispute between Germany and Spain regarding the Caroline Islands was adjusted by Pope Leo XIII in 1886. The Samoan difficulty between Germany and the United States was settled by a conference held in Berlin in 1889. A treaty of peace between the United States and Mexico was signed in Washington at the close of Cleveland's administration. And a few weeks ago a war between France and Germany — perhaps a general European conflict — was averted by the Algeciras Conference.

Let us cherish the hope that the day is not far off when the reign of the Prince of Peace will be firmly established on the earth, and the spirit of the gospel will so far sway the minds and hearts of rulers and cabinets that international disputes will be decided, not by standing armies, but by permanent courts of arbitration, — when they will be solved, not on the battlefield, but in the halls of conciliation, and will be adjusted, not by the sword, but by the pen, which "is mightier than the sword." May the nations of the earth study and take to heart this lesson, that "peace hath her victories no less renowned than war," victories more substantial and more enduring. May they learn that all schemes conceived in passion and fomented by lawless ambition are destined, like the mountain torrent, to carry terror before them, and leave ruin and desolation after them; whilst the peaceful counsels of men assembled, as you are, under the guidance of Almighty God, are sure to shed their silent blessings around them, like the gentle dew of heaven, and to bring forth abundant fruit in due season.

The United States Should Take the Lead in Limitation of Armaments.

ADDRESS OF JUSTICE DAVID J. BREWER OF THE
UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I did not intend to say anything when I came here. I came to listen and to learn; but I do move the adoption of this